FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.2159 OF 2006

Revansidhappa @ Bapu Gurusiddhappa Loni ..Applicant
Versus
State of Maharashtra ..Respondent

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders

---

Mr.A.P.Mundargi Sr.Advocate i/by Ganesh Gole for the applicant.

Mr.K.V.Saste APP for the State.

Mr.S.S.Salunkhe, Advocate for the original Complainant.

Coram : R.S.Mohite,J

Date : 20.6.2006.

PC

1. This is an application for grant of bail. The present applicant who is shown as an accused alongwith 10 other persons in C.R.No.261/2005 registered by Faujdar Chawdi Police station, Solapur, for offences punishable under Sections 320, 201, 120-B, 364, 365 & 368 of IPC. On perusing the material collected by the prosecution during the

investigation it is clear that there are circumstances prima facie indicating the involvement of the present applicant and it is difficult to hold at this stage that there is no material against the present applicant. The deceased was the nephew of the present applicant. After the death of his father, Rajesh was conducting the business alongwith the present applicant and his brother Basavraj. The circumstances which stand out against the present applicant are as follows :-

(a) He had a strong motive to do away with the deceased as there is strong business rivalry ;

(b) He has been last seen together at 7.30 P.M. on 29.5.2005 by Servant Satish and Kadri who was the driver. These 2 witnesses have seen the applicant and the co-accused by name Basavraj leaving the shop premises alongwith the deceased.

That thereafter dead body of the deceased was found about 200 K.M. away in Karnataka State on the next day and the body was sent for post mortem at 4.00 P.M.;

(c) That the statements of Satish and Kadri further indicate that the present applicant returned back at the same evening and informed them as in case anybody enquired about the whereabouts of Rajesh, they should say that they do not know it.

2. Finally, there is some material to indicate that the present applicant was sitting at Dhaba alongwith co-accused Malang Shinde from whom there is discovery of knife. In the circumstances, not a fit case for grant of bail. Rejected.

(R.S.Mohite,J)